



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,035	04/19/2001	Antonio Morlacchi	6023-133US(MJ/X/13646)	6525
7590	06/16/2004		EXAMINER	
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P. One Commerce Square 2005 Market Street-Suite 2200 Philadelphia, PA 19103			HAMLIN, DERRICK G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/838,035	MORLACCHI, ANTONIO
	Examiner Derrick G. Hamlin	Art Unit 1751
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 March 2004</u> .		
2a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u> </u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u> </u> is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 11-16</u> is/are rejected.		
7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>9-10</u> is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u> </u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u> </u> is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:		
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u> </u> .		
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
Attachment(s)		
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u> </u>		
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u> </u>		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u> </u>		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Driskill et al (4925732), is withdrawn in view of the applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-8 and 11-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driskill et al. (4925732).

Driskill discloses a laminate is provided that comprises flexible moisture permeable adherends and a moisture permeable adhesive. The laminate has good moisture transmitting characteristics with good bond strength. The laminate finds utility in functional applications such as shoes. A particular group of laminates are provided that provide for both waterproof characteristics and breathability. (abstract) Example 4 teaches a cowhide leather and a waterproof material made by adhering a membrane to a knit fabric. Adhesive D was applied to a 7.5 cm square of each material in a dotted pattern. The adhesive was allowed to dry for 2 hours, then the two coated faces were placed together. Heat was applied with a household iron to the fabric side of the laminate for about 20 seconds. (col. 12, lines 54-66). The thickness of the layer is 25

microns (col. 4, line 25). The invention employs a one-component, hydrophilic, block polyurethane (col. 3, lines 59-61).

With respect to claim 12, it is well known in the art that a shoe may be made with two or more pieces of leather sewn together.

The applicant argues that it is not clear whether the glue is applied to the fabric side or to the membrane. It is clear that if 'heat is applied with a household iron to the fabric side of the laminate', the glue pattern would have to have been on the opposite side to avoid it sticking to the iron (col. 13, lines 63-64).

The applicant further argues that the reference fails to teach that the fabric layer may be eliminated, however the fabric layer is not required to be eliminated, as it is not between the membrane and the leather. Again, it is clear that the fabric is the outer most or innermost layer and that the leather is bonded directly to the membrane with a dotted glue pattern.

Additionally, even if the method claims were eventually deemed allowable, the leather made by the process would not necessarily be deemed allowable as well.

Therefore the instant process for water proofing a leather material would have been obvious in view of the cited prior art as the reference teaches or suggests all of the instantly claimed limitation.

In view of the forgoing, the above claims have failed to be patently distinguishable over prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Driskill discloses the claimed invention except for the distance between the glue dots. Although the examiner takes the position that the leather use or application would influence the amount of glue and the distance between the dots, there is nothing in the reference cited to make the instantly claimed amounts of glue used obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of the prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derrick G. Hamlin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from ~8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Derrick G. Hamlin

6/6/04



YOGENDRA N. GUPTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700